

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has allowed claims 1-23. The Examiner has rejected claims 24-27. The Examiner has objected to claims 28-31. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 24-31.

Regarding claim 24, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner states, "Because in Osaki the call setter performs the operation associated with the management of the users communication mode. (which is referred to as a call, herein). [sic] Also it must be emphasized that a data unit with a call setup command corresponds to a call." However, the Examiner continues to cite "line setting processors" of Osaki as allegedly disclosing "a link layer processor of a multiprocessor control block." As Applicant stated in the response to the previous Office action, Applicant notes that, in col. 6, lines 63-67, Osaki appears to distinguish the operations of line setter 211 and call setter 212, stating, "...the line setter 211 performs the operation associated with the setting of a line channel, while the call setter 212 performs the operation associated with the management of user's communication mode...." Given the Examiner's continued assertion of "line setting processors" of Osaki as allegedly teaching "a link layer processor of a multiprocessor control block," the Examiner's assertion that "the call setter performs the operation associated with the management of the users communication mode (which is referred to as a call, herein)," and Osaki's apparent distinction of the operations of line setter 211 and call setter 212, it can logically be concluded that Osaki fails to disclose a "method for processing ingress data units in a link layer processor of a multiprocessor control block in a communication switch" comprising "receiving a first ingress data unit corresponding to a call."

Moreover, both line setter 211 and call setter 212 are shown in Fig. 2 of Osaki as being within line setting processor 108. Thus, as the Examiner continues to assert that a call setup signal is received at the line interface of Osaki and selection is made by the path management processor of Osaki, any alleged functionality of line setter 211 and/or call setter 212 would appear to be inapplicable to the features of "receiving a first ingress data unit corresponding to a call" and "selecting a first selected intermediate processor of a plurality of intermediate processors included in the multiprocessor control block" of claim 24.

Also, Applicant notes that Osaki not only shows layer-2 processor 209 as being present in line setting processor 108 of Fig. 2, but also distinguishes layer-2 processor 209 of Fig. 2 from either of line setter 211 or call setter 212. Thus, Applicant submits that Osaki does not disclose a method for

processing ingress data units in a link layer processor of a multiprocessor control block in a communication switch, as alleged by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 24 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 25 and 27, as noted above, Applicant submits that Osaki fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 24, from which claims 25 and 27 depend. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 24 and claims 25 and 27 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 26, the Examiner acknowledges that Osaki fails to teach a round robin scheme. As noted above, Applicant submits that Osaki fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 24, from which claim 26 depends. Thus, if Osaki fails to disclose both the subject matter of claim 24 and the additional feature recited in claim 26, Applicant submits that Osaki cannot render claim 26 obvious. Moreover, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not cited any suggestion in the prior art to combine a round robin scheme with the teachings of Osaki. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 26 is in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

02/28/2005

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.
115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 347-9223 (phone)
(512) 347-9224 (fax)